

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Figs. 1-6. A legend "PRIOR ART" has been provided in Figs. 1-6.

The sheets replace the original sheets.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

### **REMARKS**

This is in reply to the non-final Office Action mailed May 29, 2008. Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for his careful review and consideration of this application.

In the subject Action, claims 1-7 were rejected on art based rejections; claim 4 was objected to; and claims 6-7 were rejected under §112, second paragraph. Applicants have amended claims 1-7. No new matter has been entered. Claims 1-7 remain pending in the present application. In light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections and advancement of this application to allowance.

### **Drawings**

The drawings were objected to because reference character "5" of Figure 1 is not mentioned in the description. Applicants submit that reference character "5" designates "adjacent sides" in the specification. Applicants have amended paragraph 3 of page 1 accordingly.

At paragraph 2, the Examiner suggested that Figs. 1-6 should be designated as "Prior Art". Figs. 1-6 have been labeled in this manner.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections.

### **Claim Objections**

Claim 4 was objected to because of various informalities. Specifically, the Office Action states that there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitations "the rear substrate" and "the most outside barrier rib" in claim 4. Claim 1 has been amended to recite "a rear substrate" and "a first plurality of barrier ribs." Claim 4 depends on claim 1. It is thus submitted that there is now antecedent basis for the limitation "the most outside barrier rib" in claim 4. In addition, claim 4, as amended, does not recite "the rear substrate". Thus, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 6-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Office Action states that the limitation “the cross section” in lines 2 -3 of claim 6 has no sufficient antecedent basis because there are two different cross sections recited in the claim. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 6 depends on claim 4 which depends on claim 1. Claims 1 and 4 have been amended to define and recite “the cross section” definitely and more clearly. Accordingly, the issue raised by the Examiner has been resolved, and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested. It is noted that the amendments discussed in this and the preceding two sections were not made to overcome an art based rejection. Accordingly, such amendments should not be construed in a limiting manner.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Matsuura (U.S. Patent No. 5,670,843). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 is directed to a multi-typed plasma display panel which is a unit plasma display panel used for forming a large screen. Claim 1 recites, in part, “at least one second barrier rib formed along the cross-section inside of a seal line in order to prevent the sealant of the seal line from penetrating into the inside of the first plasma display panel.”

In contrast, Matsuura fails to disclose or suggest “at least one second barrier rib- formed along the cross-section inside of a seal line in order to prevent the sealant of the seal line from penetrating into the inside of the first plasma display panel.” Rather, Matsuura discloses a plasma addressed display device having a two-layer flat panel structure in which a plasma cell 1 and a display cell 2 are stacked. See Matsuura, col. 3, ll. 55-58; Fig. 1. More specifically, Matsuura discloses a microsheet glass 6 which is interposed between the lower substrate 3 and the upper substrate 7. An ionizable gas is sealed in the gap between the microsheet glass 6 and the lower substrate 3. A liquid crystal 10 is injected between the microsheet glass 6 and the upper substrate 7. *Id.* at col. 4, ll. 1-14. The lower substrate 3 is bonded to the lower surface of the microsheet glass 6 by a bonding material 13 between a barrier rib 5a situated to an outer side and a barrier rib 5b situated to an inner side. *Id.* at col. 4, ll. 15-19.

The barrier rib 5a and barrier rib 5b disclosed in Matsuura are only used for keeping the gap between the lower substrate 3 and the microsheet glass 6, and for dividing a display area into discharging cells (as shown in Fig. 1). The barrier rib 5b does not suggest preventing the bonding material 13 from penetrating into the inside of the plasma cell. Further, disposing the bonding material 13 between the barrier rib 5a and barrier rib 5b disclosed in Matsuura does not suggest at least one second barrier rib formed along the cross-section inside of a seal line. Matsuura fails to disclose or suggest "at least one second barrier rib- formed along the cross-section inside of a seal line in order to prevent the sealant of the seal line from penetrating into the inside of the first plasma display panel", as recited in claim 1 of the present application.

Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of claim 1 is respectfully requested for at least the above reasons.

Claims 2-7 are dependent claims and so are also believed to be allowable over the art of record. Applicants do not otherwise concede the correctness of the Examiner's rejection and reserve the right to make additional arguments as may be necessary. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

### Conclusion

This response is believed to be responsive to all points raised in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all of the currently pending claims. Should the Examiner have any remaining questions or concerns, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney at (612)336.4755 to discuss the same.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account 13-2725.



Dated: 28 August 2008

Respectfully submitted,  
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.  
P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903  
(612) 336-4755

By Brian H. Batzli  
Brian H. Batzli  
Reg. No. 32,960  
BHB/SZ/jle